

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

TORRIANNO WALPOOL,)	
ID # 02075250,)	
Petitioner,)	
vs.)	No. 3:18-CV-2939-L-BH
)	
LORIE DAVIS, Director,)	
Texas Department of Criminal)	
Justice, Correctional Institutions Division,)	Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge
Respondent.)	

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION

By *Special Order No. 3-251*, this habeas case has been automatically referred for findings and recommendation. Before the Court is the petitioner's *Motion to Stay in [A]beyance the Writ of Habeas Corpus, and Leave of Court*, received on March 19, 2019 (doc. 18).

The motion seeks the same relief as the petitioner's prior *Motion to Stay the § 2254 Petition and Hold in Abeyance and Grant Leave of Court to Ex[h]aust [Actual] Innocence Claim Recant in State Court and Return to Amend the § 2254 with Ex[h]austed Claim*, received on March 13, 2019 (doc. 16). On March 15, 2019, it was recommended that the prior motion to stay be denied. (See doc. 17.) The new motion to stay does not provide any additional argument, and it should be denied for the same reasons as the prior motion to stay.

The petitioner's motion to stay should be **DENIED**.

SO RECOMMENDED this 21st day of March, 2019.


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions and recommendation must file specific written objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).


IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE